

Interview Summary

Application No.

08/243,638

Applicant(s)

Daniel H. Abelow

Examiner

Steven R. Yount

Group Art Unit

2411



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Steven R. Yount

(3) _____

(2) David L. Fiegenbaum

(4) _____

Date of Interview Mar 15, 1996Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: 1, 4, 5, 17, and 23

Identification of prior art discussed:

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

See Attached

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

S. Y.

OK 10/18

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Interview Summary (3-15-96 with David L. Fiegenbaum)

Applicant's representative provided the following clarifications as to claim subject matter and terminology:

"local information" in claim 1 is information relating to a user's use of a product and is exchanged between the user and the product.

"product information" in claim 1 could comprise local information, analyzed or processed local information or other information.

"means for taking action" in claim 1 is a means, located for example at the remote party, which does something in response to the product information. The means for taking action could also be located at the product.

"means for controlling the taking of action" in claim 3 controls the means for taking action based on the results of the analyzer's analysis of the product information.

"new interface elements" in claim 4 corresponds to changing the type of or adding to the local information which can be exchanged between the product and the user.

The "product module" in claim 5 is the customer based product design module (CB-PD module) disclosed in the specification.

"for" in line 2 of claim 17 is a typo and should be deleted.

Support in the specification for claim 23 can be found, for example, at page 36, lines 20-25.